



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/460,944	12/14/1999	ERAN SITNIK	PHA23.898	3145

24737 7590 07/16/2003
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS
P.O. BOX 3001
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

EXAMINER

BUI, KIEU OANH T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2611

DATE MAILED: 07/16/2003

15

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/460,944	SITNIK, ERAN	
Examiner	Art Unit	2611	
KIEU-OANH T BUI			

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 January 2002.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hwang (U.S. Patent No. 6,049,823) in view of Levin et al. (US Patent No. 6,173,279 B1).

Regarding claims 1 and 7, Hwang discloses a television system comprising: a connection configured to be operatively coupled to a connection of an other television (Figs. 1a-1d); and a processor, i.e., a channel processor, configured to provide query information to the other television (Figs. 1a-1d/item 1) and configured to automatically provide queried information in response to a query request from the other television, i.e., a user can order any requested on-demand services from any television and can interact with other televisions in the group (see col. 1/lines 55-65).

Hwang does not further identify exactly those requests as query information “identifying at least one of content and channel currently watched on the other television” and providing “queried information identifying at least one of content and channel currently watched at said television” in response to a query request from the other television as amended by the Applicant; however, the technique of using “a query request” from a user to request for “query information” from another user, either those users uses televisions, phones, faxes or computers is taught by Levin as Levin discloses an exactly same technique as mentioned by using a query or group of information queries within the validation requests as the user wants to access directly on-line to his or her service provider for additional information on services and/or products (see Levin, Figs. 1, 2A & 2B, col. 1/lines 45-67; and col. 2/lines 15-46; col. 3/line 32 to col. 4/line 47 for more details on the query databases and responses therein as the user can request a movie information to a currently watched movie, for example, by accessing to an information server for additional information in real-time, see col. 2/line 60 to col. 3/line 4). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hwang’s television-to-television interactive system with Levin’s teaching technique in using query information as means for communicating between PCs or PC-televisions, it is well-known in the art that a PC can be incorporated into a TV as a PCTV for handling television and PC functions, as long as there is a request for that queried information initiated by one of the interactive television users as desired.

As for claims 2-3 and 8, in view of claim 1 above, Hwang and Levin further discloses “wherein said connection is configured to provide said query and queried information to the other television”, i.e., using the internal link among the workgroup (col. 5/lines 34-38) and “wherein said processor is configured to receive query compliance status information identifying if said television is set up to share queried information with the other television” (Hwang, col.

17/lines 35-43; and Levin, col. 4/lines 7-64 as a plurality of users can share the queried information from the information servers).

As for claims 4 and 9, Hwang and Levin further suggests wherein said processor is configured to receive identifying information, i.e., a request from a user with identifying information (Hwang, Fig. 2 and col. 13/lines 19-32), from a user prior to enabling the user to do at least one of set and change query compliance status information (Hwang, col. 10/lines 6-9; and Levin, col. 5/line 60 t col. 6/line 12 as a grammar is used as a unique transaction identifier included in the (validation) request).

As for claims 5 and 10, the step of “wherein said processor is configured to provide any queried information to the other television that does not violate the query compliance status of the other television” is suggested by Hwang as Hwang suggests that the command session can be terminated or interrupted if some query compliance status is violated or improperly done (Hwang, col. 14/lines 44-61).

As for claims 6 and 11, Hwang further discloses “wherein the connection is one of an in-home network connection and an Internet connection”, i.e., a groups of households connected to each other for receiving interactive TV broadcasting signals and using LAN for accessing the Internet (remote office) as well (Figs. 8-10 and col. 13/lines 19-48).

Regarding claims 12-14 and 16-20, these method claims and system claims with same limitations are rejected for the reasons given with respect to the system claims of 1-11 as already disclosed above.

As for claim 15, Hwang and Levin further suggests “wherein said identifying is performed by a mediator that is separate from each of said plurality of televisions”, i.e., a control center which oversees the operation and is separated from each of the plurality of televisions (Hwang, Figs. 3a-3b) and Levin reveals including a service host 120 acts as a mediator between the PC 104 regarding as a PCTV, it is well-known in the art that a PC can be incorporated into a TV as a PCTV for handling television and PC functions and to other devices 126 (Levin, Fig. 1).

Conclusion

3. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a). A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2611

4. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314, (for Technology Center 2600 only)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Krista Kieu-Oanh Bui whose telephone number is (703) 305-0095. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9:00 AM to 6:00 PM, with alternate Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Faile, can be reached on (703) 305-4380.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

Krista Bui
Art Unit 2611
June 30, 2003


ANDREW FAILE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600